DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 232 JC 680 462

By- Apuzzo, M. Pauline

Summary Report on the Annual Conference on the Nature and Demands of Two-Year College Teaching (2nd, Bennett College, June 16-21, 1968).

Pub Date 68

Note- 7p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45

Descriptors- *College Faculty, *Junior Colleges, Private Colleges, Teacher Education, *Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Orientation, Teacher Programs, Teacher Recruitment, Teaching Methods, *Teaching Models

Conferees representing 49 2-year colleges and the National Faculty Association of Junior and Community Colleges were asked to discuss the following topics: (1) recruitment, orientation, and preparation of 2-year college teachers; (2) evaluation of teaching; (3) new teaching methods and strategies, and (4) faculty involvement in academic governance. The latter two topics were left undeveloped, but two orientation models and one evaluation model were presented. Only the evaluation model is attached to the report. The conferees resolved that the two undeveloped topics of this conference be the basic concern of the 1969 conference, and recommended the following to AAJC: (1) establish a "clearinghouse" for private 2-year colleges at the national level, e.g., a column in the Junior College Journal; (2) establish an office with 2-year college faculty concerns as principal interest; (3) increase circulation of the Junior College Journal and coverage of the needs of 2-year college faculty. (MC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MEMO TO: Commission on Instruction
American Association of Junior Colleges

FROM: Sr. M. Pauline Apuzzo, Marymount College of Virginia
Director of Conference

SUBJECT: Summary Report on the Sixth Annual Conference on The Nature and Demands of Two-Year College Teaching, held at Bennett College, Millbrook, New York, June 16 - 21, 1968

It is with great pleasure and a profound sense of gratitude to the Commission on Instruction that this report of the sixth annual Bennett Conference is submitted. Unhappily, the "experience" of the Conference defies translation into the written word; the real success of the Conference remains, therefore, something of a private sharing. Nevertheless, it is hoped that this report will convey something of the more public exchange that took place during the week at Bennett College thereby providing an impetus for continuing dialogue among faculties across the nation.

Membership: The Conference constituency included 73 paid participants, a seven-man senior staff (including the director), a coast-to-coast representation of 49 two-year colleges, and a representative of the National Faculty Association of Junior and Community Colleges.

Agenda: The Conference proceeded from an essentially flexible frame of reference, i.e., the staff offered some basic questions to the participants for consideration, encouraging them then to move in the directions which, within their smaller groups, they felt to be pertinent and fruitful. Results of these daily discussions were reported to the group at large during general sessions. The basic questions fell into the following broad categories:

1) Recruitment, orientation and preparation of two-year college teachers
   a) how were you hired and what happened after that?
   b) what are the aims of your institution?

2) Evaluation
   a) what are the qualities of good teaching (avoid cliche list)?
   b) what, if any, definite statements of policy regarding evaluation might you suggest?

3) New methods of teaching and teaching strategies
   a) what are some means of on-going faculty improvement?

4) Faculty involvement in academic governance
   a) to what extent should faculty be involved in policy making?
   b) to what extent do faculty want to be involved?

Recommendations: The recommendations which emerged from the 1968 Bennett Conference may be assessed in several ways: firstly, as comments by individuals and/or groups suggested at the evening general sessions; secondly, as proposals directly

JC 680 462
ED 025 232

offered to AAJC; thirdly, as suggestions for the continuance and planning future Bennett Conferences. Regardless of the recommendation's source, however, it seems important that all major contributions be included in this report.

1. Comments Proceeding from Daily Discussion

A. Recruitment, Orientation, Preparation

1) An elaborate orientation model was presented by Robert Fenn, illustrating what the Connecticut Junior College system is attempting to do to meet this problem. Details of this procedure are available from Bob by contacting him at: Manchester Community College, 146 Hartford Road, Manchester, Connecticut 06040.

2) Dr. Frances Kelly and members of the Professional Development Project, a research study being conducted at State University of New York at Buffalo presented their findings and suggestions to date to the group. Spirited discussions emerged as reaction to the SUNY address. Details of this model for orientation may be obtained by contacting Fran at: State University of New York at Buffalo, Foster Annex, Library Circle, Buffalo, New York 14214.

B. Evaluation

1) One of the smaller discussion groups developed a tentative model for faculty evaluation (attached) which seems to have considerable merit, but remains open-ended to ensure maximum freedom for implementation.

2) A group of interested persons from the private, two-year institutions - later called the "survival group" - met to evaluate themselves in terms of a centrally crucial issue - their continuing existence. The questions they raised and their recommendations are appended to this report. The "survival group" was privileged to have Dr. Kenneth McKay on campus at Bennett during the week of the Conference. Dr. McKay, currently engaged in an AAJC sponsored project to investigate some of the problems relevant to the private two-year institution, met with our people to dialogue these issues. A recommendation was made to Dr. McKay that the questionnaire he is sending to the private institution be extended to faculty members also. Each of the Bennett Conference participants received a copy of the questionnaire to bring back to his campus and to solicit a response thereto.

C. Teaching strategies and on-going improvement

Essentially, this topic remained somewhat undeveloped in discussion but held great interest for the group at large. To this end,

recommendations to include this area as a basic one of concern in 1969 evolved into the theme and development of the '69 Bennett Conference Projection. (See Planning for '69)

2. Proposals to AAJC

A consensus was reached during the final session of the 1968 Conference asking that the AAJC implement the following recommendations:

A. That a "clearinghouse" for communication pertinent to the private two-year colleges be established at the national level of AAJC, e.g., a regular column in the Junior College Journal.

B. That a person or persons whose chief task would be involvement with two-year college faculty concerns be so constituted at the AAJC office.

C. That greater circulation of the Junior College Journal be effected and that greater space be devoted to issues and problems more concrete to the present needs of two-year college faculty.

Planning for '69: Roger Garrison, in his opening remarks to the group on Sunday evening, June 16, averred to the fact that the Bennett Conference has developed, in a way, from an idea into an institution. This remark was one of praise; it was also one of questioning. How long can an "institution" like the Bennett Conference survive, without becoming stratified? At the end of our week of dialogue, however, opinion - including Roger Garrison's - made it clear that atrophy was not a by-produce of the Conference. It was instead, with a sense of continued dedication and anticipation that we - staff and participants - set ourselves to the task of planning for the 1969 Conference.

Naturally, it is too early to suggest a detailed pattern for '69, but a general theme has emerged and certain suggestions to implement this theme effectively have been offered. These have been enthusiastic offerings; even as I draft this report, suggestions received since my return home lie on my desk. The following outline, then, constitutes a general overview for next year's Conference.

OVERVIEW - PROJECTION '69 - BENNETT CONFERENCE

I. General Theme:
Nature and Demands of Two-Year College Teachers and Teaching

II. Specific Theme:
"A Learning Thing"

III. Areas of Concern:
A. Teaching strategies - present and future.
Developmental models for educational effectiveness including:
1) instructional innovations and technology
2) computer and educational media techniques
3) humanity-humanities and the teaching machine
B. Faculty leadership in two-year institutions
1) articulation of ideas
2) communication among all in campus community
3) effectiveness of institutional objective and goals in terms of co-responsibility

IV. Implementation of Ideas:
A. Keep Conference "unstructured" and flexible in format
B. Bring back participants from this and past years' Conferences to share their experiences and to provide greater continuity to the Conference as a whole.
C. Be sure faculty from vocational-technical and career areas in two-year institutions are represented in '69.
D. Keep contact with participating institutions during the year and ask that all participants bring to the 1969 Conference such materials as: the college catalogue, faculty handbook, et al. pertinent references.
E. Direct the notices for 1969 Conference to faculty members as well as to administration; suggest a list of topics that might be discussed, so that participants may bring relevant materials with them if they so desire.
F. Keep Conference membership largely restricted to teaching faculty; include some administrative persons - e.g., Academic Dean; include at Conference some students, if possible. Retain wide national distribution of participants.

Administrative Details: The inclusive fee for the Conference was $130.00 per participant. The total budget was computed to be $9,637.00, leaving $292.80 balance for 1968 and a total balance of $741.90 on deposit for the 1969 Conference.

The 1969 Conference will continue under the direction of M. Pauline Apuzzo, Marymount College, 221 E. 71st Street, New York City. She will be assisted by Abe Bernstein, Adele Loysen and other members of the 1968 senior staff. Unfortunately, neither Roger Garrison nor Irene Kiernan will be able to return in 1969, though their spirit and past direction will certainly motivate all Conferences to come.

New faces will become part of the senior staff; some of those nominated by this

year's staff include: John Chittendon, Paul Cornaby, Arlene Hantjis, William Stanley. Participants from previous years were also named for staff consideration -- all of those suggested will be contacted by the director by letter.

President Don Eldridge has once again offered the marvelous facilities of Bennett College for the 1969 Conference; we have gratefully accepted his invitation.

The final statement of the week spent at Bennett was a wish, mutually expressed, that we "might continue to venture along the paths which have brought us to where we are". "Where we are" would have been nowhere at all had it not been for certain persons to whom, as director, I would at this time like to express my deepest gratitude:

To Adele Loysen and Don Eldridge; to Roger Garrison and Irene Kiernan; to Abe, Frank, Mary, Howard; to the secretaries, the kitchen and housekeeping staff; to the bartender and the plumber...

To Bill Harper, Roger Yarrington and the AAJC staff...to Ellen and the Marymount College crew...

To each one of the participants of the '68 Conference...

To the One who brought us together and may see fit to keep us going... strong...

Thank you,

Thank you,

Thank you.

APPENDIX

Questions Raised by the Private Junior College Group

1. Is there a need for an Association of Private Junior Colleges?

   A step toward saying "yes" is apparently the need for private junior colleges to form a political pressure group that will stimulate official interest in State or Federal financial support.

2. Should there be a section in the AAJC Journal devoted to Private Junior Colleges?

3. The above question brought the need for a clearinghouse of information dealing with private junior colleges, a clearinghouse that can give facts, for example, or interpretations on:

   a. Why, specifically, did X Private Junior College close down?

   b. In what states have Private Junior Colleges organized a group, or State Association of some kind?

   We should begin probably by writing to AAJC in Washington about the existence of non-existence of a "clearinghouse".

4. A member of the group pointed out the need to have a consultant in Washington, D.C., who could advise the Private Junior College that hires him on areas of Federal financial support: where is it, what is it, how do you get it?

5. Frances Kelly pointed out the need for each Private Junior College to have an adequate public relations system that would make known what the "character" of its school is.

6. This question relates to No. 3., i.e., "clearinghouse". We should ask our Deans and Presidents what information they have on Private Junior Colleges, and we should find out what our administrators are doing with this information.

7. Interest was again expressed in getting specific examples of innovations from the members of the group.

APPENDIX (cont'd)

A Tentative Model or Paradigm for Teacher Evaluation
(For Your Consideration)

Three Criteria----
(1) Purposes for teacher evaluation
(2) Criteria for teacher evaluation
(3) Procedure for teacher evaluation

1. Purpose: should be to improve teacher quality in the classroom. Purpose was not to evaluate for pecuniary or promotional reasons. Interested in what goes on in the classroom and to what degree a teacher can be made more effective by the process of evaluation.

2. Criteria: for assessing classroom performance.
   a. Ability to communicate.
   b. Knowledge of subject.
   c. Flexibility with regard to methods and approach.
   d. Use of varied resources.
   e. Student involvement - rapport, "Are kids with you?"
   f. Up-to-dateness - currency - use of new, relevant materials.
   g. Articulation of objective - goal, but flexible.
   h. Creativity - resourcefulness.
   i. Dress and demeanor.

3. Procedure: for evaluating teachers (Basic)
   (1) Self-evaluation
   (2) Observation by others
      a. Evaluators -- oneself; students; colleagues; department chairman; dean; etc. (People - written/non-written)
      b. Techniques -- many (unending)
         1. Student opinionaires - written forms
         2. Writing out objectives by Instructor.
         3. Dual approach - involving teacher and evaluation (using same set of criteria)

Big Point -- Evaluation is not a "one shot" affair; it is a continuing or sequential process.

Big question not settled -- who within the institution is responsible for evaluating? Faculty Committee, Dean, Department (Division) Chairmen? Students?

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 4 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION